



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/098,543	03/18/2002	Mari Omori	220963US2S	4953

22850 7590 05/20/2005

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

HA, THANH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2194

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/098,543

Applicant(s)

OMORI ET AL.

Examiner

Ha Thanh

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 May 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/14/2003.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-28 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. The following claim language is indefinite:

- i. As to claim 11, line 4, and claim 12, line 5, it is unclear which is generated? (i.e. the request is acquiring and is generated at the same time ?; is generated by what ?; or the request is generated by something else before being acquired?).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crawford (U.S. Patent 6327579), in view of Jarossay et al. (hereinafter Jarossay) (U.S. Patent 5734907).
5. As to claim 1, Crawford teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method for providing information processing service by a computer [col. 1, line 17], comprising:
 - detecting an event which requests an additional information processing service associated with an information processing service provided through network [col. 3, line 19 and col. 3, lines 27-28];
 - requesting the additional function of providing the additional information processing service to execute processing [col. 2, lines 30-33].
6. Crawford does not specifically teach referring to library in which invocation of an additional function of providing the additional information processing service is defined. However, Crawford teaches refer to a database to search for requested records [col. 3, lines 31-34]. In addition, Jarossay teaches access to a library that provides functions for information service management services [col. 3, lines 39-41 and col. 4., lines 64-67].
7. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill of the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teaching of Crawford and Jarossay because Jarossay's teaching of referring to a library look up for invocation of

function's information would provide a one-place lookup for functions therefore saving time and effort.

8. As to claim 2, Crawford teaches detecting a linkage event with which another additional information processing service is requested from the additional information processing service [col. 4, lines 50-54],

referring to the library in which invocation of an additional function of providing the another additional information processing service is defined [col. 3, lines 31-34 and abstract "additional resources"], and

requesting the additional function of providing the another additional information processing service to execute processing [abstract "additional resource" "program execution"].

9. As to claim 3, Crawford teaches wherein the additional function commonly used by a plurality of information processing services [col. 8, lines 14-16].

10. As to claim 4, Crawford teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method for providing information processing service by a computer [col. 1, line 17], comprising:

recording data that represents an operation state of an information processing service provided through network [col. 20, lines 44-46]; and

providing the recorded data that represents the operation state to a function of providing an information processing service associated with the information processing service [col. 21, lines 1-7].

11. Crawford does not specifically teach the operation state is to an additional function and the information processing service is the additional processing service. However, Crawford invention is clearly indicated that it is for additional resources made available to the customer's needs [abstract].

12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have recognized that Crawford teaching could be reasonably read into as it is applied to additional information processing service and the function is additional function.

13. As to claim 5, this claim is functionally equivalent to claim 4, except that the limitations are applied to additional information processing service. Although Crawford is silent about these limitations as applied to additional information processing service, his invention is clearly indicated that it is for additional resources made available to the customer's needs [abstract].

14. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have recognized that Crawford teaching could be reasonably read into as it is applied to additional information processing service.

15. As to claim 6, Crawford teaches wherein the additional function commonly used by a plurality of information processing services [col. 8, lines 14-16].

16. As to claim 7, Crawford teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method for providing information processing service by a computer [col. 1, line 17], comprising:

acquiring a request of an information processing service provided through network [col. 2, lines 29-36]; and

in compliance with request, requesting a function execute processing, wherein the additional function provides an information processing service associated with the information processing service [col. 2, lines 29-32].

17. Crawford does not specifically teach the function requested is additional function execute processing and the information processing service it provides is additional information processing service. However, Crawford invention is clearly indicated that it is for additional resources made available to the customer's needs [abstract].

18. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have recognized that Crawford teaching could be reasonably read into as it is applied to additional information processing service and the function requested is additional function execute processing.

19. As to claim 8, this claim is functionally equivalent to claim 7, except that the limitations are applied to additional information processing service. Although Crawford is silent about these limitations as applied to additional information processing service, his invention is clearly indicated that it is for additional resources made available to the customer's needs [abstract].

20. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have recognized that Crawford teaching could be reasonably read into perform on additional information processing service.

21. As to claim 9, Crawford teaches referring to a table that correlates the request with the additional function, thereby specifying additional function corresponding to the request [col. 35, lines 40-46].

22. As to claim 10, Crawford teaches wherein the additional function is commonly used by plurality of information processing services [col. 8, lines 14-15].

23. As to claim 11, Crawford a method providing information processing service by a computer, comprising:

acquiring request an additional information processing service, which is generated on the basis of processing an information processing service provided through a network [col. 3, lines 22-29];

in compliance with the request, requesting an additional function to execute processing, wherein the additional function provides the additional information processing service [col. 3, lines 31-38].

24. As to claim 12, Crawford teaches the method for providing information processing service according to claim 11, further comprising

acquiring a request of another additional information processing service, which generated on the basis processing of additional information processing service [col. 2, lines 29-32], and

in compliance with the request of another additional information processing service, requesting an additional function of providing another additional information processing service to execute processing [col. 2, lines 29-32].

25. As to claim 13, Crawford teaches the method according to claim 11 further comprising, between acquisition the request and the request of execution, referring to a table that correlates the request with the additional function, thereby specifying additional function corresponding to the request [col. 35, lines 40-46].

26. As to claim 14, Crawford teaches wherein the additional function is commonly used by plurality of information processing services [col. 8, lines 14-15].

27. As to claims 15-16, these are an article of manufacture claims that correspond to method claims of claims 1-2. Therefore, these are rejected for the same reason as to claims 1-2 above.

28. As to claims 17-18, these are an article of manufacture claims that correspond to method claims of claims 4-5. Therefore, these are rejected for the same reason as to claims 4-5 above.

29. As to claims 19-21, these are an article of manufacture claims that correspond to method claims 7-9. Therefore, these are rejected for the same reason as to claims 7-9 above.

30. As to claims 22-24, these are an article of manufacture claims that correspond to method claims 11-13. Therefore, these are rejected for the same reason as to claims 11-13 above.

31. As to claim 25, this is system claim that corresponds to method claim of claim 1. Therefore, this is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above.

32. As to claim 26, this is system claim that corresponds to method claim of claim 4.

Therefore, this is rejected for the same reason as claim 4 above.


33. As to claims 27-28, these are system claims that correspond to method claims of claims 7-8. Therefore, these are rejected for the same reason as claims 7-8 above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ha, Thanh whose telephone number is 571-272-7220. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 571-272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


MENG-AI T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ELECTRONIC BUSINESS CENTER 2100